REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Request for Continued Examination:

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

5

Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25, 27 have been amended to include the limitations which are fully supported in paragraphs [0034] and [0035] of applicant's specification. Referring to the paragraph [0034], the applicant states: "Shown in step

10 410, **after entering the download firmware mode, the initialization data 160 stored in the ROM 125 is used to initialize the optical disc drive 100**…", and further referring to the paragraph [0035], the applicant states: "**After the downloading of the operational firmware 150 is complete**, **the microprocessor 135 is initialized** with the starting address in the RAM 120 of the operational

15 firmware (step 460)…", it is obvious that the microprocessor is inactive (not initialized) while the optical disc drive is being initialized. Therefore, the applicant believes that the amendments made to claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25, 27 introduce no new matter.

In addition, editorial errors found in claims 1 and 26 have been corrected with no

20 new matter introduced.

Moreover, claims 38-47 are newly added, and include the limitations fully supported by claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 16 and the paragraphs [0034] and [0035] of applicant's specification. No new matter is introduced.

25 ## Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lewis et al., 2003/0097552 A1.

Response:

Claim 1

30 Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations "wherein the electronic

device circuit is initialized by the initialization data, and **the microprocessor is inactive while the electronic device circuit is being initialized**". The applicant believes that this claimed limitation is not taught or suggested by Lewis.

In the paragraph [0038], Lewis expressly teaches:

5   *"In operation of the communication device 100 of FIG. 1, **the processor 108 initializes the communication device 100 on power up or reset** and reads the boot PROM 110, and executes the contained routines. The communication device 100 then under direction of the processor 108 communicates through one of the external interfaces 106, 102, with the management device (not shown). The*

10   *processor 108 of the communication device 100 reads its device ID from the device ID storage 116 and communicates it and any additional information, such as configuration parameters or saved firmware version, to the management device. The management device selects the appropriate firmware for the communication device 100 and downloads it to the communication device 100*

15   *through one of the external interfaces 102, 106. The processor 108 of the communication device 100 loads the received firmware into RAM 112, configures itself, and begins operation by processing the firmware placed in the RAM 112"*

Referring to the above paragraph, as Lewis' communication device 100 is

20   initialized by the processor 108, it is obvious that **Lewis' processor 108 is responsible for initializing the communication device 100. Thus, Lewis' processor 108 must be activated/initialized prior to initializing the communication device 100**. Therefore, the applicant believes that Lewis fails to disclose the claimed limitation "**the microprocessor is <u>inactive</u> while the electronic device circuit is**

25   **being initialized**". (*emphasis added*)

In addition, after carefully reviewing the other cited references "Hu" (US 6,170,043) and "Kamihara" (2002/0169904), the applicant would like to point out that neither Hu nor Kamihara discloses the claimed limitation "**the microprocessor is inactive while the electronic device circuit is being initialized**".

30   As none of the cited references teaches the above-identified limitation of

amended claim 1, the applicant believes that the amended claim 1 should be placed in condition for allowance, and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

5   Claims 11, 16, 21, 25 and 27

Independent claims 11, 16, 21, 25 and 27 have been amended to include the limitations which are similar/identical to the newly added limitation of amended claim 1. In light of the above arguments of claim 1, the applicant believes that amended claims 11, 16, 21, 25 and 27 should be found allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections

10   under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 15, 20 and 30

Claims 7, 15, 20 and 30 are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 16 and 27, respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1, 11, 16 and 27 are found allowable.

15

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18-19, 22-23, 26, 28 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lewis et al., 2003/0097552 A1 and Hu, US 6,170,043.

20   **Response:**

Claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18-19, 22-23, 26, 28 and 31-35 are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25, 27, and should be allowed if claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25, 27 are found allowable.

25   **Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103**

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lewis et al. in view of Kamihara et al., USPGPub 2002/0169904.
Response:

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent upon claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is

30   found allowable.

Patentability of New Claims 38-47

Claims 38 and 44

In light of the above arguments of claim 1, as none of the cited references teaches

5   or suggests the claimed limitations "a microprocessor coupled to the interface unit for

controlling the electronic device, wherein **the microprocessor is <u>inactive</u> while the**

electronic device is being initialized" of claim 38 and the claimed limitations

"**activating the microprocessor <u>after</u> the electronic device is initialized**" of claim

44, the applicant therefore believes that claims 38 and 44 should be placed in

10   condition for allowance. (*emphasis added*)

Claims 39-43 and 45-47

Claims 39-43 and 45-47 are dependent upon claims 38 and 44, and should be

allowed if claims 38 and 44 are found allowable.

15

Conclusion

Based on the above arguments, the applicant respectfully submits that all of the

rejections set forth in the Office Action dated 08/26/2009 have been overcome and the

pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully

20   requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If a telephone

conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited

to contact the undersigned applicant's representative at the number indicated below.

25

30

Sincerely yours,

_____/Winston Hsu/_____   Date: ____11/24/2009____

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5   P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10   Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in
D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)